DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 455 FL 020 105

AUTHOR Edwards, Doris Dillard
TITLE A Survey of Selected Intensive English Programs on the Campuses of Higher Education.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 62p.; Research paper for Master of Education, Texas A and M University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *College Second Language Programs; Curriculum Design; *English (Second Language); Foreign Students; Higher Education; *Intensive Language Courses; *Program Design; Scheduling; Student Characteristics; Surveys; Teacher Salaries; Tuition
IDENTIFIERS Dallas Baptist University TX; North Texas State University; Texas A and M University; Texas Wesleyan University; University of Houston TX; University of Mary Hardin Baylor TX; University of South Carolina; University of Texas Arlington

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire and interview survey of the coordinators of seven Texas institutions investigated the organizational structure and curricular focus of university intensive English language programs. The institutions included Dallas Baptist University, North Texas State University, Texas A&M University, Texas Wesleyan University, the University of Houston, the University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, the University of South Carolina, and the University of Texas at Arlington. Information from the University of South Carolina was also included. The results are presented in narrative form and include information on the following aspects of program design: governance; objectives; administration and staff; teacher qualifications; membership in professional organizations; teacher orientation; professional development; faculty meetings; teacher evaluation; program evaluation; foreign student populations; male-to-female student ratios; attendance patterns; use of student quotas; difficulties with particular national groups; recruiting; admission requirements; hospitality and orientation; placement and progress testing; program structure; tuition; class size; evening classes and activities; academic credit; electives; special skills courses; English as a Second Language for special purposes; tutoring; language laboratory; scheduling; sociolinguistic, strategic, and discourse competence; availability of resource materials; alumni followup; perceived ideal supportive role of the program; program strengths; and areas for future development. Survey data and questionnaire are appended. (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED344455

# A SURVEY OF SELECTED INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS ON THE CAMPUSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

a paper submitted by

Doris Dillard Edwards

to

Dr. Viola Florez

of Texas A&M University

as a result of research conducted for EDCI #685 in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

Summer 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Doris Edwards

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Major Subject: Teaching English as a Second Language

FL 020 105



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

A Survey of Selected Intensive English Programs

on the Campuses of Higher Education

Summer 1991

Doris Dillard Edwards
B.A., Baylor University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Viola Florez

The main purpose of this study was to gather empirical data for the purpose of establishing a norm for comparison of the organizational structure and curriculum focus of selected intensive English programs in higher education.

Holding to the models set forth by the National Asociation for Foreign Student Affairs (1982) and the international organization of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (1989), in addition to the previous research models of Grosse and Lubell (1984) and Jacobs (1986), a questionnaire was developed for use in personal interviews with seven program coordinators of intensive English programs in Texas. These included: Dallas Baptist University, North Texas State University, Texas A&M University, Texas Wesleyan University, the University of Houston, the University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, and the University of Texas at Arlington.

To give added dimension to this comparative survey, information from the English Program for Internationals at the University of South Carolina was also included in this report.

The collection of descriptive and analytical data includes such salient features as foreign student population, program governance, staff and faculty, tuition costs, structure and schedule of classes, program strengths, and areas for future development.

The survey outcomes provide a point of reference for all IEP professionals committed to excellence and growth.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For their kind cooperation, encouraging words, and interest in this project, I would like to recognize and express appreciation to the following people:

My Committee Chair, Dr. Viola Florez, for her enthusiastic endorsement of this research and initial helpful suggestions

The IEP program directors who graciously and generously gave me an hour of a busy day and validated my efforts with their trust in sharing:

Mary Jane Elliott--University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, Belton, Texas

John Jenkins--Dallas Baptist University, Dallas, Texas

Stephen Lewis--University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Texas

Rebecca L. Smith--North Texas State University, Denton, Texas

Vicki Sorrensen--Texas Wesleyan University, Fort Worth, Texas

Joy S. Tesh--University of Houston, Houston, Texas

Deanna Wormuth--Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas

Friends Glen Rice and Jim Hamrick at the University of South Carolina in Columbia, South Carolina, for their significant contribution across the miles

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT.....i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....ii

LIST OF TABLES.....v

INTRODUCTION.....1

METHOD.....2

SURVEY RESULTS

Governance.....2
Objectives.....4
Administration/Staff.....4
Teacher Qualifications.....5
Memberships in Professional Organizations.....6
Teacher Orientation.....6
Professional Development.....6
Faculty Meetings.....7
Teacher Evaluation.....7
Program Evaluation.....7
Foreign Student Populations.....8
Male/Female Ratio.....8
"Show" Rate vs. I-20s Issued.....8
Quotas.....9
Difficulties with Particular National Groups.....9
Recruiting.....10
Requirements for Admission.....11
Arrival Hospitality.....11
Orientation of New Students.....11
Placement Testing.....11
Testing of Progress.....13
Program Structure.....13
Tuition Cost.....14
Class Size.....14
Evening Classes/Activities.....14
Academic Credit.....14
Electives.....15
Special Skills Courses.....15
ESL for Specific Purposes.....15
Tutoring.....16
Language Laboratory.....16
Schedule of Classes.....17
Sociolinguistic/Strategic/Discourse Competence.....17
Resource Materials.....18
Alumni Follow-Up.....18
Ideal Supportive Relationship.....19

Program Strengths.....21
Areas for Future Development.....21

CONCLUSION.....22

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....22

REFERENCES.....24

APPENDIX

A HOST INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED IN SURVEY.....26

B QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN SURVEY.....27

C SURVEY RESULTS: OVERALL MEAN SCORES.....31

D INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAM NORMS.....32

E COMMON FEATURES OF INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS....36

F CREATIVE IDEAS AND SOLUTIONS.....38

G ADDRESSES OF CONTACT PERSONS IN PARTICIPATING PROGRAMS.....40

INDEX.....52

# LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | FOREIGN STUDENT POPULATIONS | 41 |
| 2 | RECRUITING/PROCESSING OF NEW STUDENTS | 42 |
| 3 | PROGRAM STRUCTURE/TUITION COSTS | 45 |
| 4 | STRUCTURE OF CLASSES | 46 |
| 5 | SCHEDULE OF CLASSES | 47 |
| 6 | PROGRAM STRENGTHS | 49 |
| 7 | AREAS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT | 51 |

# A SURVEY OF SELECTED INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS ON THE CAMPUSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

## INTRODUCTION

The survey cited in this study compares various aspects of eight Intensive English Programs (IEPs) in academic settings of higher education. (See APPENDIX A for Host Institutions Represented in Survey.) Seven of these are in Texas, one in South Carolina. The research focuses on foreign student populations, program structure, organization, faculty, curriculum, recruiting, orientation, testing, laboratory requirements, class schedules, program strengths, and areas for future development.

The evaluation instrument was a three-page questionnaire developed for use in a personal interview with each program director. (See APPENDIX B for Questionnaire.) All who were chosen to be represented in this study demonstrated an attitude of openness and a willingness to help improve "the process and the product" for TESOL everywhere.

Information amassed in this study not only makes it possible to evaluate the relative characteristics and strengths of the participating programs, but also establishes norms for comparison and identifies possible areas for future growth and improvement.

## METHOD

Appointments were made by telephone with the directors of seven Intensive English Programs on university campuses in Texas. With the questionnaire designed specifically for this purpose, personal interviews were conducted with the director or coordinator of each program. At the time of the interview, a copy of the questionnaire was provided to acquaint each person with the scope and sequence of the inquiry. Participation of the IEP in South Carolina was made possible through correspondence and conversation by phone.

Additionally, a telephone interview was conducted in Jakarta, Indonesia, with Dr. A. Sunjono, Director of the English as a Foreign Language Department at the Atma Jaya Catholic University. Although this interview was not as extensive as the others and, consequently, is not embodied in the resulting data, it did serve as an interesting point of reference in the research.

Statistics were computed and descriptive data compiled in order to compare the eight responses to each question. Information was then analyzed to determine any existing patterns of similarity or contrast.

## SURVEY RESULTS

A considerable variation was found to exist in the area of program governance. One-half of the eight programs included in this study were found to be self-governing. They have space provided by the host institution but generate all

their own revenues and are free to choose how their monies are allocated. They have one individual to whom they report: the Provost, Vice-President for Financial Affairs, the Director of the International Center, or the Chairman of Modern and Classical Languages.

The remaining four programs, which operate with either financial assistance or constraints, function under the auspices of the following governing academic units:

Department of Communications (which houses English, Speech, and Languages)

Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics

The Language and Culture Center in cooperation with the Department of English

International Studies and Programs Unit

One IEP surveyed receives generous assistance from the university to which it is linked. Not only are the space and utilities provided, but faculty benefits from the school comprise twenty-three percent of the IEP teacher salaries.

On the other hand, there are those which grapple with budgetary concerns. In one instance, ninety percent of the revenue goes for salaries, leaving virtually no "seed money." On another campus, the situation is essentially characterized as "a business trapped in an institution." From gross revenues, one IEP must pay seventeen percent to the department which manages the registration and processing of IEP students, two and a half percent to the International Office, plus three and a half percent to the host institution for space rented.

One common objective is shared by all eight programs surveyed; i.e., to prepare students for a successful academic experience. In the words of one director, it is "helping students improve their skills in reading, writing, listening, speaking, research, and western-style critical thinking, in order to be successful in classes in U.S. universities, and to be successful in professional activities using English."

Some of the IEPs operate in three separate tracks: academic, professional, and personal. Two programs have an added component in cross-cultural understanding. One specializes in TOEFL preparation, while others view the TOEFL score as a by-product of their integrated approach to instruction.

Ministry, along with ESL instruction, is the primary goal for one program whose host institution has no TOEFL requirement for admission. The commitment is to "taking students where they are and leading them to where they can succeed." The faculty, staff, and student body combine efforts to encourage the foreign students in the realization of their goals.

There is wide variance among the organization of administrative staff and faculty. Larger numbers of personnel are inherent in the larger programs of 125-200 students. The staff rosters often include such positions as curriculum coordinators, level coordinators, a coordinator for testing, a coordinator for cross-culture, a lab coordinator with assistants, counselors, secretarial help, and student assistants who serve in various capacities.

In two programs of comparable size, one has no secretarial assistance of its own. Needed requests must be taken to the office of its governing academic unit. The other benefits from several student assistants who help, not only with secretarial duties, but also with the computer lab, airport transportation, driving vans, and tutoring.

On another campus, a single individual serves as program coordinator, the faculty, and the secretary! Conversely, the coordinator of one large program chooses to join faculty ranks each year by personally teaching one of the classes.

It was found that all full-time faculty are required to have a master's degree in either TESL, linguistics, or a related field. Prior TESL experience is a prerequisite in the hiring of teachers for seven of the IEPs. One program further stipulates that the previous teaching experience be with an Intensive English Program. Two directors prefer those with overseas teaching experience; one notes a preference for persons who speak a second or third language. Only one-fourth of the programs surveyed express a willingness to hire Teaching Assistants.

In still another IEP, the director prefers individuals whose experience includes teaching in elementary school, the rationale being that these teachers are likely to be "creative, to be accustomed to dependent students in large numbers, to understand the need for being flexible, and to be willing to work harder and longer hours in order to get the job done."

The staff and faculty from seven of the eight IEPs in this study are affiliated with the state organization for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Furthermore, some programs provide these memberships for all personnel. In most programs, faculty are encouraged to have membership in the international TESOL group as well. In addition, three-fourths of those surveyed maintain membership in the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Most of the directors/coordinators also hold memberships in one or more of the following: the American Association of Intensive English Programs, AMIDEAST, and the Unisity Consortium of Intensive English Programs.

Over half of the IEPs studied conduct extensive workshop training for teachers at the beginning of each school year. One requires that new teachers have sixteen weeks of training with the curriculum coordinators. Another program has a one-day training session, featuring a video presentation of Krashen's Language Two. Faculty members in still another IEP are given a procedural handbook, and new teachers are provided with ongoing support by being paired with an experienced teacher for shared office space.

In one location, "buddy teacher" assignments provide sustained help and encouragement for faculty,and the director meets individually with each new teacher on a periodic basis.

Professional development sessions are scheduled every two months to allow one group of teachers to hear reports from TESOL and to have a "trial run" for paper presentations. In still another place, faculty and staff are given both money

and release time for professional development activities. Here faculty members participate in two conferences or workshops annually. Moreover, five to seven training workshops are conducted each year "in house" to promote professional development. The bi-weekly faculty meetings of fifty minutes each routinely include special reports and training activities also.

A majority of the other programs conduct faculty meetings on a regular basis as well. One holds meetings at weekly intervals. Another schedules regular sub-committee meetings, in addition to monthly faculty meetings. Communication is maintained by one director chiefly through the use of memos. The modus operandi of still another IEP includes three meetings in the Fall, two in the Spring, one in the Summer, plus one at the conclusion of each term. One other strategy consists of: a meeting prior to the first week (in addition to the teacher training preceding each term), one meeting at the end of the first week, then Open Forum meetings at two-week intervals thereafter.

All the programs surveyed have some type of planned evaluation of teachers. While each IEP has a student evalution at the conclusion of each term, only three conduct an organized systemic evaluation. One of these routinely follows the guidelines set forth in TESOL's "Statement of Core Standards for Language and Professional Programs." The other two participate in a program-wide evaluation yearly in connection with the annual performance review of the university. One is currently embarking upon the TESOL self-study. The other

has its curriculum directors and/or the director regularly making teacher observations each year. New teachers are evaluated every six months, but the very newest have "almost constant review", e.g., turning in tests, etc.

Table 1 in this report presents a detailed summary of targeted foreign student populations. (See Table 1 for Foreign Student Populations.) Statistics reveal that the eight schools have total student enrollments ranging from 1500 to 39,000 students. More than half the schools have 25,000 or more students. Three of these institutions have enrollments ranging from 1500 to 2450. The total number of foreign students on each campus varies from 114 to 2751 and represents 34 to 130 countries of origin.

Intensive English Programs differ in size from 13 to 200 students per term. The average number of countries represented in the IEPs varies from 5 to 50. There is an equal proportion of male and female students in only one-fourth of the programs. Males typically outnumber female students; but in one group, females predominate by a 4:1 margin.

Generally, the "show" rate versus the number of I-20s issued is a point of concern for over half of these eight IEPs. This problem seems accentuated with students applying from such countries as China, Iran, Lebanon, and other areas effected by war or tyranny.

Nevertheless, three programs have extraordinary success in the percentage of arriving students. The program with a ninety-nine percent arrival rate benefits from more than

sixty-five overseas recruiting offices and thoroughly screens prospects before the I-20s are issued.

The school having a rate of ninety-six percent requires prepayment of the first semester's tuition and completion of every other part of the application process before issuing an I-20. Hence, only a student with the most serious of intentions ever receives one of these documents. One other safeguard on this campus is the required prepayment of an additional one thousand dollars, which is held in safekeeping for a student's use in the event of an emergency. If no such need arises, the money is then used to purchase the ticket home following graduation.

Only two of the IEPs surveyed have a stipulation in regard to quotas. In order not to give "leverage" to any one group of nationals, these two accept no more than forty percent of total enrollment from any one country. One program, however, does operate with what is described as a "passive" quota, i.e., not processing certain applications as quickly as others--knowing that, meanwhile, these students will probably be receiving I-20s from other schools.

Half of the programs questioned spoke of difficulties or challenges encountered with various national groups. The following comments were among those heard in this study:

Middle Easterners--argumentative

Asians--vague

Japanese--don't talk in class but "raise hell" in the dorms

Arabs--plagiarize, cheat, can't spell

Koreans--a complicated culture; argumentative

Thai--speak only Thai

One IEP reported having "difficulty with a small number of students from Japan and the Middle East who register for courses but do not attend classes on a regular basis. They seem to see their stay in the U.S. as a vacation period."

Similar recruiting strategies are used in most programs, i.e., brochures to embassies, mailing lists to foreign colleges and public schools, paid advertising in international publications, as well as all free advertising possible. (See Table 2 for Recruiting and Processing of New Students.)

Some IEPs have persons in charge of recruiting to make periodic visits to the offices of various educational agencies, international businesses, and embassies. They also hold informal meetings at conferences on a regular basis. One program recently sent representatives to attend overseas exhibitions.

Another makes use of nearby opportunities by keeping applications in the Office of Continuing Education and soliciting new students from the families of students already enrolled in the program.

In some places, the recruiting is done by persons who are not in charge of the day-to-day operation of the program. These various individuals include:

IEP Institute Director

Director of International Studies

Director of the Language and Culture Center

Director of Sponsored Students (sharing responsibility with the IEP Director)

Recruiters in overseas recruiting offices (previously mentioned)

Table 2 shows the admission requirements which are standard for all IEPs in this survey. One program additionally specifies a B average from high school. Another prefers students who have scored a minimum of 350 on the TOEFL. One IEP states a minimum age requirement of 18 years of age, whereas another accepts students who are 16. Some require a photograph, while others do not. Admission fees vary considerably--from $10-$110. For half of the programs, the fee is $100 or more.

Arriving students are met at the airport as a matter of procedure in some programs, while others charge for this service. In one large city, an Arrival Hospitality Committee is one of many emphases for a community council whose goal it is to serve the needs of the international community on campus.

Upon arrival on campus, students experience some form of orientation in all the IEPs studied. There is substantial variance, however, in the scheduled length of orientation, ranging from five days to one hour. One program orients students only in regular class sessions. Table 2 records the common orientation emphases.

The testing of new students is carried out in diverse ways, but half the IEPs use some part of the Michigan Battery in their scheme for evaluating new students. Three programs include a reading component, and one incorporates a listening

comprehension section with "tasks to do." Five programs require a writing sample, but there is a considerable difference in the amount of writing required. One asks for one-half page, whereas another has no specified length for the composition, but provides one and a half hours in which to write. On still another campus, the TOEFL score alone serves as the criterion for student placement.

The host institution in one instance stipulates that even foreign faculty members, as well as students scoring 550-600 on the TOEFL, must be evaluated in an oral interview. But if the individual has a TOEFL score of 600+ and will not be a Teaching Assistant, the university's English Language Placement (ELP) is not required.

One novel approach consists of initial placing of students into three groups. Then on the second day, in Oral Skills classes, it is the task of all teachers to make a finer distinction, placing students into one of five different levels of proficiency. To allow time for this process, the purchase of textbooks is delayed until the second week, during which time the teachers actually accompany their students to the bookstore.

Whereas one program requires students to maintain a B average in order to continue their study, another has no testing at all beyond that of initial placement. Instead of grades, students have periodic conferences with their teachers and receive a final report to indicate completion of a certain level and/or readiness to enter the subsequent level. Another unique aspect of this approach is that students may

move to the next level at anytime during the semester, whenever the teachers involved consider the move to be appropriate.

Another IEP supervises program-wide testing at the end of the first week, then after ten days, again at mid-term, and at the time of final examination. In contrast, an IEP of comparable size directs only the pre- and post-testing, leaving the remainder up to the discretion of each teacher. The Michigan Proficiency Test is administered by one program to determine progress at midterm.

One program maintains complete records on the progress of each student, including English skills, attendance, motivation, and adaptation to American culture and education. Every two months, the students are provided with a complete and detailed evaluation.

The intensive English programs surveyed are structured typically around sessions ranging from five to ten weeks or from fourteen to sixteen weeks in length. (See Table 3 for Program Structure/Tuition Costs.) All eight provide instruction five days a week, but classroom instruction time varies from fifteen to thirty hours weekly. Five of the eight programs offer more than twenty hours each week. The weekly average is a little more than twenty-three hours.

Three-fourths of the programs studied feature five or more levels of proficiency. The IEP with the largest enrollment is organized around three levels of instruction, while the program with the least number of students is designed exclusively for intermediate-level students.

Based upon the cost per term and the projected time for completing each program, Table 3 also shows the calculated total cost for each program, ranging from $1764 (plus books and fees) for the one-semester program to $8718 (total cost) for another type of organization with a full year of study. This table also denotes an interesting comparison of the approximate cost per hour of instruction. Estimates were derived by prorating a 16-week term in each case.

A study of class structure reveals that the average number of students per class is 12, with as few as 10, and as many as 16. (See Table 4 for Structure of Classes.) None of the IEPs offers classes in the evening. One-half of them have occasional activities at night. One has a program-wide event every eight weeks, another as often as every three to five weeks. A third encourages social or cultural activity, but leaves the plans up to the discretion of each teacher.

Two of those surveyed have a plan whereby students may receive some type of credit while taking IEP classes. The program consisting of one semester of study classifies all twelve hours as electives. This credit is not given, however, if a student must repeat a course. The pre-freshman courses in reading and composition, which are designed to bridge ESL and regular academic work, are also counted as electives.

Another program has a provision for "conditional academic admission," which consists of six to eight academic credit hours in regular classes while being enrolled part-time in IEP courses. This conditional admission is permitted with a

lower TOEFL score than that required for full-time foreign students in a regular academic program.

Two programs provide for electives at the intermediate and advanced levels. In one instance, all the courses are prescribed in Levels One through Five; but going into Level Six, students may choose either a focus on cross-culture or a workshop experience/independent study with computer, TOEFL preparation, or further development of reading skills.

Another innovative approach allows for program-wide electives to be offered for one or two days each term. These include both academic and non-academic activities (e.g., hiking trips, museum trips, etc.).

Courses for Special skills are provided in seven of the eight programs studied. These options are (in order of the frequency of their appearance):

TOEFL Preparation (6)
Study Skills (3)
GMAT Preparation (3)
SAT Preparation (2)
GRE Preparation (2)
Spelling (1)
Accent Reduction (1)

One program chooses to address these concerns in regular IEP classes, while another has a focus on both academic and survival topics in a Directed Communications Lab.

In the area of ESL for Specific Purposes, one program is currently offering specialized components in business,

technology, and survival skills. Three others are continually designing programs as requested by various business and professional groups.

There is some type of arrangement for tutoring in all eight of the programs surveyed. An extra fee is charged in a few situations, but most provide free tutoring as well. Half of the IEPs incorporate the use of Conversation Partners. One has established a Writing Center, where students spend one and a half hours each week.

Laboratory requirements range from zero up to six and one-half hours weekly. In the single instance of an optional lab, the IEP makes computers for ESL instruction a standard part of its curriculum. Two approaches in this study are atypical: one requires three hours for Levels One through Three and two hours for Levels Four through Six. This particular program houses a language laboratory, a computer writing laboratory, and a reading laboratory--all of which are open seven days a week, with lab assistants available at all times. The other IEP prescribes three hours of audiovisual lab for Levels One through Four to provide simultaneous development of conversational fluency and cultural awareness. Levels One and Two have an additional two hours of workshop experience. This IEP also has an individual instruction laboratory for Levels One through Six, in which computers are used to improve specific individual needs in reading, vocabulary, writing, listening, and grammar. Level Six students have access to the university's computer writing laboratory for completing advanced level writing assignments.

The eight IEPs in this study represent eight interesting options for the schedule for classes. (See Table 5 for Daily Schedule of Classes.)

With reference to the work of Canale and Swain (1980) and to the 1983 work of Canale (as cited in Brown:199-200), a portion of the questionnaire concentrated on three areas of communicative competence which may be difficult for students to acquire apart from special consideration in curriculum-planning:

1. SOCIOLINGUISTIC COMPETENCE--knowledge of socio-cultural rules of language and discourse; judgments of social appropriateness based on understanding the roles of the participants, the information shared and the function of the interaction (e.g., greeting/parting, sending/declining invitations, criticizing, complaining, persuading, etc.)
2. STRATEGIC COMPETENCE--verbal and non-verbal strategies to help compensate for the breakdowns in communication (e.g., making repairs, coping with imperfect knowledge, and sustaining a conversation)
3. DISCOURSE COMPETENCE--the connection of sentences in stretches to form a meaningful whole out of a series

of utterances--attending to such important elements as attention-getting, topic nomination, topic development and termination

It was found in this study that the following means are being relied upon for teaching these aspects of language:

addressing informally

encompassing in oral skills class

depending on the teacher

using role play

making cultural presentations

including in orientation

Three programs were found to have invested a considerable amount of time and creative energy in order to make available a rich supply of ideas for reinforcement and enrichment. One coordinator has employed a built-in incentive for teachers to contribute regularly and often to the collective supply of resource materials. "Materials Development" is one of the categories included in the point system used for each teacher's annual report of professional activity.

Other IEPs have "The Binder" or "The Black Book" for each level of instruction, with material further classified according to themes, grammatical structures, etc. These provide a wealth of readily-available and easy-to-use materials to enhance the quality of instruction.

Less than half of the programs in this study have a plan by which they may determine the success rate of alumni after their completion of the Intensive English Program. Of those

which do, one follows up by using computer data from the Registrar's Office, one with information from advisor transcripts, and another with a form letter requesting feedback from professors.

Still another IEP made an extensive study into this matter over five years ago and found gratifying statistics: that undergraduates completing their program of instruction had significantly higher GPAs than both native English speaker counterparts and foreign students who had not attended the IEP. Furthermore, a sister office of International Programs for Students, provides an ongoing opportunity for this IEP staff to learn of any problems the alumni may be having. Likewise, because of significant relationships established in the classrooms, faculty and staff tend to serve as "informal advisors" to their former students, and thereby stay abreast of their progress.

Of the three programs which do have systematic feedback, whether it be on a regular or limited basis, two of them report students' having a B average or higher and one with students consistently making Bs and Cs. One of these has a policy of welcoming former students back to audit any of the ESL courses at any time free of charge. They may also continue to have access to the computer lab, to a tutoring service, and the editing of papers.

A variety of responses was given to the question: "What do you consider to be the ideal supportive relationship between the host institution and the intensive ESL program?". One coordinator described the ideal relationship as being one

of "freedom"--but "back up" in decisions made. Another attested to an existing good relationship, but would like to see the university express confidence in the IEP by accepting a student's successful completion of the last exit exam in lieu of a TOEFL requirement for admission into the school's academic program.

Still another suggests that Intensive English Programs be housed under academic affairs and report directly to the Provost. Furthermore, depending on the level of financial support from the host institution, "programs must be allowed adequate autonomy in decision-making."

A director whose IEP is contracted to provide a service for the host institution sees the relationship from a different perspective: "to be 'up front' and honest, to look upon the IEP as a business enterprise, and to maintain a level of trust."

One program in this study enjoys an exceptional relationship of mutual respect with the university to which it is linked. With the global emphasis in the philosophy of the school and its efforts to make contributions which have international significance, there is remarkable reciprocity of support. The IEP provides language support services for other university units and assists in university-wide international programming. It also engages in special projects designed to meet the English language training needs of other specialized groups. On the other hand, this IEP enjoys total autonomy, and all its salaries and budgets are based on revenues to the program.

Many of the program directors targeted areas in which the present relationship might be enhanced:

to have faculty status granted to IEP teachers

to have better physical facilities

to find more ways to integrate IEP students and activities into the campus life

to involve American students with the students and teachers in the area of bilingual education and ESL

to have complete autonomy

to answer directly to the Provost

to receive more financial help

to have recognition of the IEP staff and students as having expertise which can be called upon in the fields of language and culture

One coordinator, while observing the advantages and disadvantages of being "attached" to a school, noted the possibility that an IEP might be viewed solely as "a vehicle for producing revenue to subsidize other programs."

When asked, "What do you think are the major strengths of your program?", twenty-three of the twenty-five responses were distinctive. Only "student quality" and "professional and caring teachers" were mentioned two times. (See Table 6 for Program Strengths.)

Numerous areas were mentioned as targets for future development. (See Table 7 for Areas for Future Development.) Here again, only two of the responses appeared more than once. "The needs of TAs" and "ESL for Specific Purposes" were cited by two different individuals.

## CONCLUSION

The survey outcomes in this report disclose that most of the Intensive English Programs surveyed ascribe to TESOL's "Statement of Core Standards for Language and Professional Preparation Programs" (1989). Likewise, the majority are in compliance with the guidelines set forth by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (1982). (See Appendix E for Common Features of Intensive Programs.) This data analysis may serve to give pride in a sense of accomplishment, as well as to stimulate new ideas for growth and development.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study was limited in scope to a selected group of IEPs at seven institutions of higher education in Texas and one in South Carolina. Data were provided by the persons responsible for the day-to-day operations of these Intensive English Programs. It is thus not known if the findings are generalizable to a wider population. One suggestion for future research is an exploration of similar questions with every program for intensive English on the campuses of higher education in Texas. Perhaps the sampling might be further extended beyond the borders of this state.

Furthermore, an interesting comparison might be established by having a separate category to include such entities as the contracted ESL programs, i.e., American English as a

Second Language (AESL) and English Language Services (ELS), as well as those sponsored by our government: the Defense Language Institute in San Antonio and the many offices of Continuing Education and Adult Basic Education.

Being largely exploratory in nature, this research necessarily took a global approach in search for comparative data. Perhaps a more objective study might be made by using an evaluation instrument constructed of multiple-choice/ fill-in-the-blank questions and a Likert scale rather than the personal interview.

Future study in the area of communicative competence--with particular focus upon the sociolinguistic, strategic, and discourse aspects--might result in an instructional module of specific strategies for developing students' language proficiency in these areas, which are weighted with possibilities for misunderstanding and being misunderstood. Such material might aptly lend itself to usage in the language laboratory.

# REFERENCES

Barrett, Ralph Pat. 1982. Overview. In THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS, Ralph Pat Barrett (Ed.), 1-2. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Brown, H. Douglas. 1987. PRINCIPLES OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND AND TEACHING. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Fox, Robert. 1988. ESL Program Administration in Higher Education. A report reprinted in ERIC DIGEST, December 1988. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Grosse, Christine Uber and Dawna Lubell. 1984. A Cross Program Evaluation of Major Intensive English Programs. A paper presented at the 18th Annual TESOL Convention, Houston, Texas, March, 6-11, 1984.

Hastings, Ashley J. 1990. The Focal Skills Approach: A New Structure for ESL Programs. TESOL Newsletter 24(21): 21-22.

Jacobs, Holly. 1986. The Organization and Administration of ESL Programs in Selected Public and Private Universities: Factors Related to Program Integration and Effectiveness. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas.

Pennington, Martha C. 1991. BUILDING BETTER ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Pennington, Martha C. 1985. Effective Administration of an ESL Program. In ON TESOL '84, Penny Larson, Elliott Judd, and Dorothy S. Messerschmitt (Eds.), 301-316. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Staczek, John J. and Susan J. Carkin. 1985. Intensive English Program Fit in Traditional Academic Settings: Practice and Promise. In ON TESOL '84, Penny Larson, Elliott L. Judd, and Dorothy S. Messerschmitt (Eds.), 289-300. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Statement of Core Standards for Language and Professional Preparation Programs. 1989. Alexandria, Virginia: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.

Stoller, Fredricka L. 1989. Consciousness-Raising Documents for the IEP Administrator. TESOL Newsletter, 23(6):8-9.

Young, Richard. 1990. A Systems Approach to Curriculum Innovation to Intensive English Programs. A paper presented at the 24th Annual TESOL Convention, San Francisco, California, March 6-10, 1990.

# APPENDIX A

## HOST INSTITUTIONS OF INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS PARTICIPATING IN SURVEY

| | ESTABLISHED IN |
|---|---|
| Dallas Baptist University (DBU) | 1989 |
| North Texas State University (NTSU) | 1977 |
| Texas A&M University (TAMU) | 1974 |
| Texas Wesleyan University (TWU) | 1974 |
| University of Houston (UH) | 1975 |
| University of Mary Hardin-Baylor (UMHB) | 1970 |
| University of South Carolina (USC) | 1979 |
| University of Texas at Arlington (UTA) | 1980 |

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW WITH DIRECTOR OF INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAM

Name of School:_____
Address:

Total number of foreign students_____
Percentage of total student enrollment_____

Name of Director:_____

Date of Interview:_____

DATA COLLECTION:

governing academic unit (e.g., Modern Languages Department, English, Linguistics)

program objectives, philosophies, methodologies

support staff: administrative faculty

types of degrees

fields of degrees

years of experience in ESL

membership in professional organizations

training/in-service workshops (frequency and kind)

faculty meetings (frequency and kind)

program/teacher evaluation (frequency and kind)

average enrollment per semester
ratio of M/F
average number of countries
quotas from any country?
difficulty with any particular group?
number of I-20s arriving as against number of I-20s issued

recruitment of students
    what type?
    whose responsibility?

student entrance requirements

    TOEFL score

orientation for new students
    how long?
    what format?

number of weeks per session

number of hours of instruction per week

number of days of instruction per week

average number of students per class

daily schedule

evening classes/activities

language lab

availability of tutoring

tuition cost per session
    books included?

major source of funding for program (i.e., tuition, the school itself, grants)

number of levels of instruction

content areas (basic skills)

    any overlapping or linkages? (e.g., composition/reading or listening and speaking skills)

special skills (e.g., study skills, TOEFL preparation, accent reduction, survival English)

courses in English for Specific Purposes (e.g., Business English, English for Engineers)

courses for academic credit

electives for high-int./advanced students

provision in curriculum for:

- acculturation
- sociolinguistic competence
- strategic competence
- language functions
- discourse analysis
- speech registers
- non-verbal communication

testing (frequency and kind)

- How was reliability established? (if developed in-house)
- How is the testing coordinated?

materials (i.e., texts, workbooks)

resource materials (collective, individual?)

QUESTIONS IN SUMMARY:

How well do students perform in academic course work after completing this program? Is there a plan for follow-up once they are released for full academic study?

What do you consider to be the ideal supportive relationship between the host institution and the intensive ESL program?

What areas have you targeted for future development?

What do you think are the major strengths of this program?

1.
2.
3.

Addtional questions about ESL writing (in compliance with the assigned research in EDCI #685):

1. Do you employ a traditional (structured) approach to the teaching of writing?

2. If not, what strategies do you use? (e.g., process writing, journal writing, topical writing, related to interest of students, etc.)

3. Have you found any techniques or materials which are especially helpful?

# APPENDIX C

## SURVEY RESULTS: OVERALL MEAN SCORES

### FOREIGN STUDENT POPULATION

| | |
|---|---|
| 19,597 | total enrollment |
| 1,173 | total number foreign students |
| 73 | total number countries represented in school |
| 108 | IEP enrollment |
| 24 | countries represented in IEP |
| %25 | IEPs with quota system |
| %75 | percentage I-20s "show" vs I-20s issued |
| 2:1 | male/female ratio |

### PROGRAM STRUCTURE

| | |
|---|---|
| 5 | levels of instruction |
| 12 | students per class |
| 23 | weekly hours of instruction |
| 5 | days of instruction weekly |
| 14 | weeks per term |
| 1012 | approximate number of hours to complete |
| $1980 | approximate tuition charge per 16-week period |

# APPENDIX D

## IEP PROGRAM NORMS

FOREIGN STUDENT POPULATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1500-39,000 | | total enrollment |
| | 5 | 25,000 or above |
| | 3 | 1500 to 2450 |
| 114-2751 | | total foreign students |
| | 1 | more than 2000 |
| | 2 | 1500 to 2000 |
| | 5 | less than 1500 |
| 20-130 | | total countries represented |
| | 4 | 100 to 130 |
| | 1 | 50 to 100 |
| | 3 | less than 50 |
| 13-200 | | IEP enrollment |
| | 4 | 100 to 200 |
| | 2 | 50 to 100 |
| | 2 | less than 50 |
| 5-50 | | countries represented in IEP |
| | 4 | 30 to 50 |
| | 3 | 10 to 30 |
| | 1 | less than 10 |
| 0-2 | | IEPs with 40% quota from any one country |
| 40-99% | | percentage I-20s "show" vs. I-20s issued |
| | 3 | 90% or more |
| | 3 | 60% to 90% |
| | 2 | less than 60% |

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

1-7 number levels

- 2 having 7
- 3 having 6
- 1 having 5
- 2 having 1-3

15-30 hours instruction weekly

- 2 28-30
- 3 22-28
- 2 20-22
- 1 less than 20

8 having 5 days of instruction weekly

5-10 or 14-16 weeks per term

- 4 16 weeks
- 1 15 weeks
- 1 8 weeks
- 2 various combinations

240-1344 approximate hours to complete

- 2 over 1300
- 2 1250 to 1300
- 2 1000 to 1250
- 2 less than 1000

1 semester--1 year approximate time to complete

- 6 one year
- 1 two semesters
- 1 one semester

$1764-$8718 approximate cost to complete

IEPs listing a total cost:

1 over $8000

1 $6000

1 $5000

IEPs listing tuition + books and/or fees

1 over $7000

0 $6000 to $7000

2 $5000 to $6000

1 $3000 to $5000

1 $1000 to $3000

$3.62-$7.35 tuition cost per hour of instruction

3 $4.46 to $6.85 (total cost)

4 $3.62 to $7.35 (tuition+books/fees)

1 $7.75 (tuition+books only)

CLASS STRUCTURE

10-16 number students per class

5 maximum 13-16

3 maximum 10-12

0 having evening classes

0-4 having evening activities

1 two or three per semester

1 every 8 weeks

1 every 3 to five weeks

1 left to the discretion of the teacher

0-2 having/allowing courses for academic credit

1 offering all as electives

1 provision for conditional academic admission

0-2 offering elective at int./adv. levels

0-5 having ESL/Special Skills

0-5 having ESL for Specific Purposes

8 having provisions for tutoring

4 via conversation partners

4 free upon request

2 for an additional fee

2 via weekly writing lab

0-6 requiring lab

1 6½ hours

4 three to five hours

1 one to two hours

1 optional

1 combined with Oral Skills class

PROGRAM CONTENT

0-5 ESL/Special Skills classes

0-5 ESL for Special Purposes

8 Basic Skills daily

# APPENDIX E

## COMMON FEATURES OF INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS*

1. Multileveled with respect to English proficiency

    a. A minimum of three levels--elementary, intermediate, and advanced

    b. Most with four to six levels, each with its own set of classes, texts, material, and teaching techniques

    c. One year sometimes needed to complete all levels

2. Standardized test for initial placement and often as a subsequent measure of progress

    a. Usually a battery of subtests yielding multiple scores for diagnostic purposes

    b. Most widely used: TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), the Michigan test, and the CELT (Comprehensive English Language Test)

3. Integration of listening, speaking, reading, and writing among the different classes

    a. Usually a grammar class also

    b. The amount of time for each depending upon the students' proficiency level

4. Typically a service unit of a college/university; may be placed within an academic department or higher institutional division (school, college, etc.)

5. Ongoing year-round program, allowing students to progress without unduly long breaks in ESL study (terms usually tied to parent institution's calendar--8 to 16 weeks)

6. Usually operating with 20-30 hours of ESL instruction per week, for a total of 200 or more hours per session

7. A variety of advisement services as well as an initial orientation program (most with ongoing orientation to acquaint students with campus and community life and with expectations of academic study in the U.S.)

8. Students typically adults who are high school graduates, most of whom plan to pursue a degree program in an American postsecondary institution after reaching an adequate level of English proficiency

9. Staffed with a Director and core faculty who are professionally trained in TESL or linguistics and/or have had solid teaching, supervisory, and/or administrative experience in the ESL/IEP field (often using graduate teaching assistants with TESL or linguistics majors--supervised by director or core faculty)

*from THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS by Ralph Pat Barrett, NAFSA, 1982.

# APPENDIX F

## CREATIVE IDEAS AND SOLUTIONS

* Monthly birthday parties
* International Field Day
* Bi-weekly Newsletter
* Resource speakers for orientation--policeman, doctor, dentist, banker, etc.
* Alternate books for the sake of students who must repeat levels
* One semester of observation in regular classes (with free auditing) for students in levels five and six in order to become acquainted with the language and culture of the American classroom
* Tests kept under lock and key
* Trip to farm with hayride and weiner roast
* Trip to grocery store with each student having a shopping list
* Student-planned one-day trip (using Texas Highways guide)
* Library trip with low-key research (i.e., compare and contrast article from a periodical)
* Use of old or recent newswire photos from newspaper office (for describing, etc.)
* Friendship Family of Host Family Program
* Each student having a faculty advisor + a peer advisor (a former IEP student)
* University I.D. card
* Buddy system with Greek organizations
* International Week with native country displays, food bazaar, parade of national costumes, etc.
* Frequent socials, trips, and musical or athletic events

* New Student Orientation agenda with considerations allowing for recovery from jet lag

* Requiring that student evaluations of teachers be typed

* Stringent attendance requirements:
  --two free absences in an eight-week period
  --a letter of probation with the third absence
  --dismissal from class with the fourth absence
  (these from a program director who listed "high academic standing" as a major strength of the program)

  Another program, whose alumni consistently maintain a B average or higher, informs students in the beginning that --if they exceed the number of excused absences--they will be dismissed, immigration will be notified, and they will not be eligible to attend the next term of IEP classes!
  In this IEP:
  --Students not allowed in class if more than 10 minutes late (up to 10 minutes--marked "late")
  --Beyond 10 minutes--marked for one hour of absence
  --Three tardies=one hour of absence
  --Maximum: 20 hours of absence

* Certificates awarded at the completion of the term

* "Graduation" exercises--complete with the University President or Dean delivering a "commencement" address; an award being given for highest scholastic achievement, i.e., a scholarship for continued IEP study; AND a reception!

## APPENDIX G

### ADDRESSES OF CONTACT PERSONS IN PARTICIPATING INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS

Elliott, Mary Jane
Intensive English Coordinator
U.B. Box 4631
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor
Belton, TX 76513

Hamrick, Jim
Associate Director
English Program for Internationals
James F. Byrnes Building, Suite 311
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Jenkins, John
Academic Dean--American English as a Second Language
Dallas Baptist University
7777 West Kiest Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75211

Lewis, Stephen
Director--The English Language Institute
University of Texas at Arlington
Foreign Languages and Linguistics
Box 19557
Arlington, TX 76019-0557

Smith, Rebecca L.
Director--Intensive English Language Institute
North Texas State University
P.O. Box 13258
Denton, TX 76203-3258

Sorrenson, Vicki
Coordinator of Intensive English Program
Texas Wesleyan University
1201 Wesleyan
Fort Worth, TX 76105-1536

Tesh, Joy S.
Associate Director--Language & Culture Center
and IEP Coordinator
University of Houston
Houston, TX 77204-3012

Wormuth, Deanna
Coordinator--English Language Institute
Department of Modern and Classical Languages
Texas A & M University
College Station, TX 77843-4238

TABLE 1

FOREIGN STUDENT POPULATIONS

| | Total Student Population | Total Number Foreign Students | Total Number Countries | Average Number IEP Students | Average Number Countries in IEP | Quota | % I-20s "Show" vs. Issued | M/F Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DBU | 2,450 | 250 | 35 | 76 | 10 | No | 99% | 3:2 |
| NTSU | 27,000 | 1700 | 130 | 180 | 30 | No | 40% | 1:1 |
| TAMU | 39,000 | 1900+ | 100+ | 200 | 35 | No | 75% | 3:2 |
| TWU | 1,500 | 150 | 75 | 38 | 20 | Yes | 92% | 3:1 |
| UH | 34,000 | 2751 | 100+ | 150 | 33 | No | 68% | 2:1 |
| UMHB | 1,825 | 114 | 34 | 13 | 5 | Yes | 96% | 1:4 |
| USC | 26,000 | 1170 | 116 | 125 | 50 | No | 70% | 3:1 |
| UTA | 25,000 | 1350 | 65 | 80 | 11 | No | 58% | 1:1 |

TABLE 2

RECRUITING/PROCESSING NEW STUDENTS

TYPE OF RECRUITING

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | trips by recruiting officials to embassies/ sponsoring agencies |
| 1 | informal meetings at conferences (NAFSA, etc.) |
| 1 | trip to overseas exhibitions |
| 3 | brochures to embassies |
| 2 | mailing lists of foreign colleges/public schools |
| 2 | word of mouth |
| 3 | advertising in international publications |
| 2 | all free listings |
| 2 | mailing to overseas bicultural centers |
| 2 | listing in ESL-IEP guidebooks |
| 1 | contact with current IEP students whose family members may be prospects |
| 1 | application forms in the Office of Continuing Education |
| 1 | overseas recruiting offices |

ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|---|---|
| 8 | satisfactory completion of secondary education |
| 8 | copy of transcript or diploma (or equivalent) |
| 8 | proof of financial support for duration of stay |
| 8 | legal status with U.S. Immigration |
| 8 | IEP application completed and signed |
| 8 | non-refundable application fee |

ENTRANCE--continued

1 minimum of B average in high school

1 minimum of 350 TOEFL score

1 minimum of 18 years of age

1 minimum of 16 years of age

2 photo(s)

1 $1000 in reserve deposit for emergency plane ticket or ticket home following graduation

1 prepayment of first semester's tuition

## NEW STUDENT ORIENTATION

length:

1 five days

2 three days

1 two days

1 one-half day

1 one hour

1 in class only

1 in class during first week--in addition to other organized orientation

included in agenda:

1 testing

1 help with housing

1 shopping trips

2 campus tour

1 trips to necessary places (bank, etc.)

ORIENTATION--continued

8 dissemination of info about IEP:
--policies
--classroom expectations (including teacher/student relationships and U.S. cultural attitudes about time, friendships, etc.)
--security matters
--insurance

1 showing of "Cold Water" (video dealing with culture shock)

PLACEMENT TESTING

7 using a test developed in-house to include:

4 oral interview

5 writing sample

4 Michigan battery (some portion thereof)

1 reading comprehension

1 listening comprehension/tasks to do

1 grammar

1 cloze

1 Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)

TABLE 3

PROGRAM STRUCTURE/TUITION COSTS

| | Levels | Hours per Week | Days per Week | Weeks per Term | Hours per Term | Est. Hours to Finish | Est. Time to Finish | Est. Total Cost | Est. Cost per Hour* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DBU | 6 | 26½ | 5 | 16 | 424 | 1272 | 1 yr. | $8718 | $6.85 |
| NTSU | 6 | 22-28 | 5 | 8 | 224 | 1344 | 1 yr. | $6000 | $4.46 |
| TAMU | 3 | 28-29 | 5 | 15 | 435 | 1305 | 1 yr. | $4725+ | $3.62+ |
| TWU | 7 | 20 | 5 | 16/5/10 | 320 | 1020 | 1 yr. | $5000 | $4.90 |
| UH | 6 | 28-30 | 5 | 14 | 420 | 1260 | 1 yr. | $5085+ | $4.04+ |
| UMHB | 1 | 15 | 5 | 16 | 240 | 240 | 1 sem. | $1764+ | $7.35+ |
| USC | 7 | 22½ | 5 | 15/10 | 337½ | 1012½ | 1 yr. | $7440+ | $7.35+ |
| UTA | 5 | 20 | 5 | 16 | 320 | 40 | 2 sem. | $3200+ | $5.00+ |

* Weeks of instruction per term were prorated in all programs to approximate a semester of 16 weeks in order to make this cost comparison.

TABLE 4

STRUCTURE OF CLASSES

| | Average Number Students | Evening Classes | Evening Activities | Academic Credit | Electives | ESL/ Special Skills | ESL/ Special Purposes | Tutoring Available | Lab Hours Weekly |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DBU | 12-16 | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | 6½ hrs. |
| NTSU | 10-14 | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3-5 hrs. |
| TAMU | 12-15 | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3-4 hrs. |
| TWU | 10-13 | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Optional |
| UH | 10-12 | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 3-5 hrs. |
| UMHB | 12-14 | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | 3 hrs. |
| USC | 12 | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 1 hr. |
| UTA | 10 | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | in Oral Skills Class |

TABLE 5

SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

DBU — one hour each:

- composition/vocabulary
- literature/reading
- TOEFL prep/grammar
- conversation/listening

one and one-half hours: computer lab

NTSU — four hours + two to three hours weekly for lab or academic skills

two core classes @ two hours each:

- * communication (reading, vocabulary, listening, speaking, pronunciation)
- * writing (grammar, library skills, research techniques)

TAMU — five hours + one hour directed lab (3-4 days a week)

- grammar
- composition + writing lab
- reading
- listening
- vocabulary
- oral skills

TWU — hours: 12:00--5:05 p.m.

forty-five minutes each:

- vocabulary/grammar
- composition/reading
- listening/speaking/conversation

one to five hours weekly: computer instruction in class or self-developed computer study

SCHEDULE--continued

UH 9:00--3:00 or 10:00--4:00

basic skills (integrated/team teaching)

three-hour lab required for Levels One through Four + two-hour workshop for Levels One and Two

UMHB MWF 8:00--10:00 + 1:00--2:00 conversation lab

TT 8:00--11:00

communicative grammar
listening/speaking skills
reading/vocabulary
writing

USC

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:30--10:00 | writing/grammar |
| 10:30--12:00 | reading/vocabulary |
| 1:30--3:00 | conversation (listening/speaking/ pronunciation) |
| 3:30--4:30 | listening lab (one day a week) for beginning-intermediate levels |

UTA 12:30--5:00 p.m.

grammar/writing (two hours)
reading (one hour)
listening/speaking (one hour)

lab with computers, audio/video tapes

TABLE 6

PROGRAM STRENGTHS

DBU

* quality, caring teachers
* educationally supportive administrative staff
* student progress (i.e., gains of 42-70 points on the TOEFL score each semester)

(50 points are guaranteed! If a student does not make the necessary TOEFL score for admission to the university, he/she may have free tuition for further study until the needed score is attained.)

NTSU

* very personal, extremely involved, intense interaction
* well-organized, articulated curriculum oriented toward being successful in the University
* lab--seven days a week--always with a lab assistant (15 computers)

TAMU

* faculty (stable, creative, team-players)
* comprehensive curriculum
* standardized evaluation procedure

TWU

* professional/caring instructors
* Intensive English Institute Director (although part-time)--devoted and dedicated
* high academic standards

Strengths--continued

UH

* the kind of students (motivation, background)
* the experience of the teachers (most with teaching experience abroad)
* governance (participatory process--input from the teachers)
* the cross cultural component of the curriculum

UMHB

* individualized instruction
* small lab groups
* good rapport/interaction of classes

USC

* collegial model of decision-making which filters down to the classroom level
* professional staff with a high level of professional and personal commitment to the program
* program autonomy ("EPI has benefited by working under university administrators who believed the program could be best served by allowing those who work in the program to make decisions.")
* recruitment of high-quality, academically bound students

UTA

* teaching ability of the staff
* overall attitude of commitment to improvement (among students and throughout program)
* a new relationship with a new department

TABLE 7

Areas for Future Development

1. Addressing the needs of TAs (mentioned twice)
2. ESL for Specific Purposes curriculum (mentioned twice)
3. The writing component of ESL instruction
4. Better strategies for TOEFL preparation
5. More connections with the business community
6. The possibility of having classes for eight hours a day for the first one or two weeks
7. TESOL self-study
8. Interactive video/software for the curriculum
9. More involvement on campus
10. More use of self-evaluations
11. Instruction in research procedures beginning with level two
12. Exit tests
13. Midterm exams
14. A student handbook
15. TASP preparation for undergraduate self-studies
16. Increasing the supply of audiovisual materials
17. Purchasing computers
18. Better salary status

INDEX

Academic Credit, 14-15
Administration/Staff, 4-5
Areas for Future Development, 21, 51
Arrival Hospitality, 11
Class Size, 14, 46
Difficulties with Particular National Groups, 9-10
Electives, 15
ESL for Specific Purposes, 15-16
Evening Classes/Activities, 14
Faculty Meetings, 7
Foreign Student Populations, 8, 41
Governance, 2-3
Ideal Supportive Relationship, 19-21
Language Laboratory, 16
Male/Female Ratio, 8
Memberships in Professional Organizations, 5-6
Objectives, 4
Orientation of New Students, 11, 43-44
Placement Testing, 11-12, 44
Professional Development, 6-7
Program Evaluation, 7-8
Program Strengths, 21, 49-50
Program Structure, 13, 45
Quotas, 9
Recruiting, 10-11, 42
Requirements for Admission, 11, 42-43
Resource Materials, 18
"Show" Rate vs. I-20s Issued, 8-9
Sociolinguistic/Strategic/Discourse Competence, 17-18
Special Skills Courses, 15
Teacher Evaluation, 7
Teacher Orientation, 6
Teacher Qualifications, 5
Testing of Progress, 13
Tuition Costs, 14, 45
Tutoring, 16